

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Appl. No. 10/787,302

NOV 15 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 13-14, 20-21 and 23-26 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by European patent No. 1 330 138 (“Valentine”). The Examiner refers to column 8, lines 24-31 (“paragraph 0052”) of Valentine; however, Applicant submits that paragraph 0052 teaches away from the present application for reasons detailed below.

Paragraph 0052 teaches that if the registration is successful, then “the serving BTS assigns and/or transmits one or more TGID codes to the MS, related to location specific [emphasis added] group calls in its coverage area”. The MS receives the new TGID code(s) and updates its scan list.

Paragraph 0052 explicitly teaches that the TGID codes correspond to “location specific” group calls, which implies that the TGID codes are also location specific. Other portions of Valentine make it clear that the TGID codes are location specific. For example, the first step of claim 1 recites “assigning (308) dynamically a location specific [emphasis added] group identification code to a group of communication units based upon said communication units’ location or cell within the radio communication system (100)”. Therefore, Applicant submits that Valentine teaches that the TGID codes are location specific and relate to location specific group calls.

The present application is concerned with the problem of informing users of talk groups that are provisioned, typically at the time of service activation, but that the user is unaware of or may have forgotten. In this sense, the talk groups and respective talk group identifiers are not location specific. Instead, the talk groups and respective talk group identifiers are user-device specific. Claim 1 has been amended to this effect. More particularly, claim 1 has been amended to recite “the user device being adapted to obtain from the dispatch network a user-device specific set of at least one provisioned talk group identifiers [emphasis added] having a respective provisioned talkgroup identifier for each talkgroup provisioned for the user device”. Since Valentine teaches away from this feature, Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended is patentable over Valentine.

Applicant submits that the amendment to claim 1 is fully supported by the application as originally filed and that no new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendment is

Appl. No. 10/787,302

found throughout the application. For example, on page 5, lines 8-14 of the description, the text “user device’s provisioned talkgroups” refers to user-device specific talkgroups. Further, support to this effect is found at least on page 9, lines 5-12, page 11, lines 8-13, page 13, lines 9-12, page 16, lines 29-31. As described on page 18, line 21 to page 19, line 2, other embodiments of the invention adapt the method and system to provide “peripheral support for a wired device which is capable of participating in wireless sessions with various talkgroups, and which has a number of talkgroups provisioned for it”. Since the application contemplates using a wired device, which is generally not considered to be mobile, it is clear that the talkgroups provisioned for the wired device are device-specific and not location-specific.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended is new and inventive over the disclosure of Valentine.

Claims 13, 20 and 25 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 13, 20 and 25 as amended are novel and inventive over the disclosure of Valentine for similar reasons provided above in respect of claim 1.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims are novel and inventive over Valentine for at least their dependence upon the independent claims. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the dependent claims recite additional features not found in the disclosure of Valentine. Examples are provided below.

Claim 23 recites that “the request and response are sent using layer 3 messages”. The Examiner contends that Valentine teaches this subject matter in column 8, lines 32-45. However, this portion of Valentine teaches that the MS intermittently scans the frequencies identified on the updated scan list, awaiting notification of a particular group call. This portion of Valentine goes on to teach other things, but is silent to teaching a request and response being sent using layer 3 messages.

Claim 26 recites that “the data structure is an enhanced registration accept message”. The Examiner contends that Valentine teaches this subject matter in column 4, line 53 through column 5, line 16. Applicant appreciates that this portion of Valentine teaches that “the system, on receiving an attachment request from a MS 112-116, will then either accept or reject the

NOV 15 2006

Appl. No. 10/787,302

request". However, this does not teach or suggest a data structure being an enhanced registration accept message.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2, 13-14, 20-21 and 23-26 under 35 USC 102(a).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejects claims 3-7, 9-12, 15-16 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine in view of United States patent No. 6,999,783 ("Toyrlyla"). Applicant notes that the claims under rejection under 35 USC 103 depend upon one or more of the claims that have been rejected under 35 USC 102. Seeing as though the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn, Applicant submits that the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) should similarly be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, early favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PADAKANDLA KRISHNA RAO

By



Allan Brett
Reg. No. 40,476
Tel.: (613) 232-2486

Date: November 15, 2006

RAB:PDB:kbc